BEFORE THE

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:
REGULAR MONTHLY BUSINESS
MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

April 19, 2000

10:15 A.M.

CIWMB Board Room 8800 Cal Center Drive Sacramento, California

REPORTED BY: Terri L. Emery, CSR No. 11598

- 1 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, APRIL 19, 2000 10:15 A.M.
- 2 * * * * *
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Good morning, everyone, and
- 4 welcome to the second day of the April board meeting of
- 5 the California Integrated Waste Management Board.
- 6 Before I begin, Madam Secretary, if you would
- 7 please call the roll and establish a quorum.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Here.
- 10 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Here.
- 12 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Here.
- 14 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Here.
- Ms. Tobias, do we have to do any formal action
- 17 to dissolve the ad hoc committee that was meeting
- 18 yesterday afternoon?
- 19 MS. TOBIAS: I don't think so. We said at the
- 20 beginning that that would dissolve upon establishment of
- 21 a quorum this morning. So since it is an ad hoc
- 22 committee by its name, I think it just dissolves.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. For those of you in the
- 24 audience who may be here on any of today's remaining
- 25 items on the agenda, there are speaker slips in the back.

- 1 If you would kindly fill one out and with the appropriate
- 2 number and bring them forward to -- we have Ms. Jeannine
- 3 Bakulich, who will be happy to process them and make sure
- 4 that when the item does come up for discussion, that you
- 5 will have time to address the Board.
- 6 Finally, we had reports from yesterday, unless
- 7 there's any additional reports.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I gave you my report.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Other than the flight from hell
- 10 and that.
- 11 Mr. Jones, anything additional?
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: No.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. We'll start with ex
- 14 parte communications.
- Mr. Jones.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Up to speed.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I said "hello"
- 19 to John Cupps and George Larsen yesterday afternoon.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Nothing.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: Just a bunch of valley
- 22 residents.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Bunch of valley
- 24 residents, I'm on the "garbage board."
- 25 (Laughter)

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: You're picking up that
- 2 terminology from Mr. Jones. I tell you "recycler."
- 3 (Laughter)
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: I only have one ex parte to
- 5 report. This morning I spoke with Stan Dixon, Gerald
- 6 Kingshoffer and John Murray from Humboldt regarding an
- 7 issue that's going to be taking place in closed session
- 8 today.
- 9 So with that, we do have any reports from --
- 10 Mr. Chandler's not here, so the two issues to be decided
- 11 is whether or not we want to hear from Ms. Fish in her
- 12 official capacity of taking over for two weeks, who loves
- 13 to be here, and the second one is that when Mr. Chandler
- 14 is not here, do we allow the delegation to flow to
- 15 Ms. Fish.
- MS. FISH: This could be my big chance.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Absolutely. Absolutely.
- 18 MS. FISH: There is no report.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay.
- 20 Then let me kind of just recap for the public as
- 21 well as for Board Members. Yesterday the ad hoc
- 22 committee approved Items 22, 24, 31, 32, 34, 40, 41, 42,
- 23 43, 44. I don't believe -- I have 45 on my list, but I
- 24 don't think that was an action item. If I'm not
- 25 mistaken, it was just an informational item.

- 1 There remains to be heard, at least in its
- 2 entirety, Items 16 and 17. Does anyone have anything
- 3 different? Okay.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: 33, I don't think we had to
- 7 make a motion but we did make a motion, if it matters or
- 8 not, that that went out for another 15 days. Just point
- 9 of information, I guess.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: So the question is, Senator,
- 11 one of the things that was done yesterday, as counsel
- 12 advised, that these matters that I just announced that
- 13 were approved yesterday were recommended by the ad hoc
- 14 committee, I believe, each time on a 3-0 vote. One of
- 15 the options that we had was to put that on a consent
- 16 calendar today and just vote that as one entire block as
- 17 approving or if in your --
- 18 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I think that's fine.
- 19 We've reviewed them so I'm going to vote "aye."
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: If you wanted to pull any of
- 21 them off. Okay. But you do have the option if any of
- 22 those -- okay. All right.
- 23 So what I would propose is to make a motion that
- 24 we adopt --
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: On 44 and 45, I'm told

- 1 let's pull those.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: 45 would not be part of the
- 3 motion because we didn't vote on 45 because that was just
- 4 information.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I just want to speak to
- 6 the issue on 45, so pull that for a vote.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: And 44?
- 8 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: 44 and 45.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. Absolutely.
- 10 So I would propose that the Board adopt the
- 11 following resolution and recommendation of the ad hoc
- 12 committee that the consent calendar consist of Items 22,
- 13 24, 31, 32, motion on 33, Item 34, 40, 41, 42 and 43.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll second.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: I had two seconds.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER JONES: No, Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right.
- 20 Mr. Eaton moves and Ms. Moulton-Patterson
- 21 seconds that we adopt the ad hoc committee's
- 22 recommendations as a consent calendar for today
- 23 consisting of Items 22, 24, 31, 32, motion for 33, 34,
- 24 40, 41, 42, and 43.
- 25 Madam Secretary, would you please call the roll.

- 1 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 3 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 5 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 7 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- 9 Okay. So what we will do is -- is there any
- 10 real preference whether we go to the informational items,
- 11 16 and 17, or dispense of Items 44 and 45? Probably
- 12 easier to deal with those that have consideration, which
- 13 would be 44, I believe.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That's fine. I just want
- 15 to make a statement on that.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure. Absolutely. Item Number
- 17 44. And I'm just trying to look for my -- Mr. Leary,
- 18 that would be consideration of the proposed emergency
- 19 regulations, playground safety. Correct? Okay. Did
- 20 you --
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: On that --
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: You wanted to make a statement.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I agree with the
- 24 subcommittee's affirmative recommendations. However,
- 25 within the playground safety and recycling grants, our

- 1 staff operates on the basis that playground does not
- 2 include swimming pools. It is not of enormous import for
- 3 this specific item because we're dealing with grammar
- 4 schools, that's what I call them, which --
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: That's sort of an oxymoron.
- 6 (Laughter)
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That's for sure. Do they
- 8 even know what grammar is? Which probably don't have --
- 9 but I think there would probably be very few, if any,
- 10 that have swimming pools.
- 11 Nevertheless, if we're talking about playground
- 12 safety and recycling grants, I think it's dangerous to be
- 13 operating on a playground definition that does not
- 14 include swimming pools because the definition in one part
- 15 of the law often acts as a precedent for other parts of
- 16 the law. Most playgrounds -- there are more playground
- 17 accidents at swimming pools than anywhere else, and it's
- 18 not only a supervisory problem, it has to do with
- 19 equipment as well -- just off the top of my head, diving
- 20 boards, the cleaning equipment that snakes through the
- 21 pool, the lip on the edge of the swimming pool, children
- 22 have different grabbing capacity than adults do, just a
- 23 number of things cause problems and drowning is a major
- 24 cause of accidents.
- 25 So staff informs me that for reasons that I

- 1 can't understand that the Office of Administrative Law
- 2 probably would not want to have a change in the
- 3 definition to include swimming pools, but if wading pools
- 4 and swimming pools aren't part of a playground, I don't
- 5 know what is.
- 6 So I would hope that for future definitions when
- 7 these grants come before us in this specific area, we
- 8 broaden our definition. I think we can do that by
- 9 regulation. If we can't do it by regulation, then I
- 10 would suggest we ask the legislature to make an
- 11 affirmative change here.
- 12 I think it's -- if the area we're concerned
- 13 about is playground safety, then I think we'd be playing
- 14 ostrich and not paying attention to swimming pools as
- 15 part of playgrounds.
- 16 So that's what I want to bring to the attention
- 17 of the Board, and I'm going to vote for this item mainly
- 18 because I agree with staff that probably there are no
- 19 swimming pools at elementary schools, maybe there are one
- 20 or two. So I'm prepared to vote for this, but for the
- 21 future, I hate to have that definition without a change.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: Would you like in addition
- 23 perhaps maybe that we request from OAL a clarification
- 24 procedure, to include that in a separate letter from what
- 25 we're doing?

- 1 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes, I would.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: If not, at least have an
- 3 affirmative, I guess, response to whether or not that
- 4 could be included. And if they say "no," then we can
- 5 just amend the regulations at some point. If not, we
- 6 have to go what you said would be another type of --
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Very good. Yes. If OAL
- 8 can handle it, and Kathryn maybe knows the process at OAL
- 9 much better than I do, but if they can handle it, that's
- 10 probably fine.
- MS. TOBIAS: Let me suggest. I don't know if
- 12 you want to hear the definition right now, just so that
- 13 all the Board Members are aware of this, but let me read
- 14 it.
- 15 Playground means "an improved outdoor area,
- 16 designed, equipped and set aside for children's play that
- 17 is not intended for use as an athletic playing field or
- 18 athletic court and includes in that area such facilities
- 19 as play equipment, surfacing, fencing, signs, internal
- 20 pathways, internal land forms, vegetation and related
- 21 structures."
- 22 So I think that I have no problem going to OAL
- 23 and requesting an opinion on that, but I will say that
- 24 what that does is takes time. My sense was that at one
- 25 time OAL was substantially backed up, and so I think if

- 1 you want a safer approach, the safer approach is to go to
- 2 look at legislation this year since that's still timely
- 3 right now.
- 4 Perhaps we could pursue both at the same time,
- 5 but I would say in terms of getting something from
- 6 OAL, plus I'm not sure this language is really going to
- 7 be susceptible to that interpretation, that it would be
- 8 perhaps a shame to miss the current legislative time
- 9 frame to get that in. So perhaps if the Board would like
- 10 to see us pursue it on both levels.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: I can't believe --
- MS. TOBIAS: And I don't mind at all going just
- 13 to OAL, but I do think that may take a little bit of time
- 14 and you may lose some time.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: I don't have any problem with
- 16 that. I think we can do both and advise staff to try to
- 17 find an omnibus bill, which is a bill that basically
- 18 contains no controversy, to the legislature and put that
- 19 in definition, that perhaps maybe for clarification
- 20 purposes you could bring us back the language to look at
- 21 or circulate to the offices and just find an omnibus bill
- 22 and work on parallel courses. I don't have a problem at
- 23 all, if that's okay with the Board and Senator Roberti.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That's fine.
- 25 MS. TOBIAS: There might be legislation going

- 1 through where this would be appropriate and it would not
- 2 be difficult to do.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: In keeping with past
- 4 traditions, and that's why that unique southern
- 5 California viewpoint about swimming pools comes into play
- 6 because the northern California guys, there's not many up
- 7 here. I was just kidding. I never saw swimming pools
- 8 either until I lived in southern California for a long
- 9 time, but it is something that's very prevalent in the
- 10 playgrounds.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, these are
- 12 emergency regs, so at some point they're going to come
- 13 back to us for -- when they become formal regs; correct?
- 14 So maybe the letter asking at the same time that these
- 15 emergency regs go in, asking for that definition would
- 16 give us time that after this is expired, then we can
- 17 maybe have an answer to include it when we do the formal
- 18 regulations, which would take care of the Senator's
- 19 concerns, and I think we still have that window open.
- 20 And you can let OAL know that this may be included based
- 21 on their definition.
- 22 MS. TOBIAS: We will definitely pursue from both
- 23 sides on our part.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. So for just
- 25 purposes of --

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I will move adoption of
- 4 Resolution 2000-191, consideration of adoption of the
- 5 proposed emergency regulations for Playground Safety and
- 6 Recycling Act Grant, AB 1055, with the amended to include
- 7 a letter asking for the definition or inclusion of
- 8 swimming pools under the definition of playgrounds, I
- 9 guess. That's it.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay.
- 12 Mr. Jones moves and Ms. Moulton-Patterson
- 13 seconds that we adopt Resolution 2000-191 as it relates
- 14 to emergency regulations.
- 15 Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- 16 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 18 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 20 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 22 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- 24 I also just want to make clarification because
- 25 what I didn't hear in the motion, and I don't think it's

- 1 proper to be in the motion, that we pursue the parallel
- 2 course of legislation. That was not part. That was just
- 3 a letter to OAL, but we also want to be able to do that.
- 4 If the Board is okay with that, we'll direct the staff to
- 5 do that and I know --
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That was not --
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: That was not part of the motion
- 8 and I want to make sure that was part of the record that
- 9 we have that. With that, so shall be ordered. All
- 10 right.
- 11 Item Number 45. You should know, Senator
- 12 Roberti, that Ms. Jordan is filling in for Mr. Weiss
- 13 today.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Very good.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: He basically left her in a
- 16 lurch because he knew that we would pulverize him with
- 17 questions and he was ready and anxious to answer those
- 18 questions, but he knew he would never have to answer.
- Ms. Jordan.
- 20 MS. JORDAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and
- 21 Board Members. This is Item 45, discussion of previously
- 22 allocated consulting and professional services funds.
- 23 As we had mentioned yesterday, this is basically
- 24 a status update of where we are with regards to the RMDZ
- 25 funding as a tire fund allocation will be coming forward

- 1 in May and that the Integrated Waste Management Account
- 2 at this time did not have savings that were substantial
- 3 to be reviewed at this point.
- With regards to this particular item, I would
- 5 like to say that after some consideration, we understand
- 6 that there are some concepts that may not have been
- 7 approved or have come to light since approval in October
- 8 of the original concepts, and what we would like to
- 9 propose doing is bringing forward an item for May which
- 10 would reallocate the RMDZ funds. So it would be a
- 11 reallocation item with regards to the RMDZ funding and
- 12 some potential options, and we would like to work with
- 13 the Board Member offices in order to meet everyone's
- 14 needs.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: That's fine with me. When do
- 16 you think we could get that information to the Board
- 17 offices? The May meeting, I believe it is the 17th-18th
- 18 or 18th-19th.
- 19 MS. JORDAN: What I was proposing to do is
- 20 actually submitting it next week, understanding that some
- 21 of the Board Members are out.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: That will give us some time
- 23 that the Board Members can look at it and take it up,
- 24 some of them in terms of presentation in the regular
- 25 course of the process, in the advisor meetings and

- 1 individual meetings with Board offices.
- 2 Any objection to that?
- 3 MS. JORDAN: Thank you.
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. All right.
- 5 Item Number 16, which is the oral presentation
- 6 of the statewide disposal characterization study.
- 7 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Good morning, Board Members.
- 8 I'm Lorraine VanKekerix with the Waste Analysis Branch,
- 9 and I'm pleased to be here today to give you an update on
- 10 the results of the statewide characterization study that
- 11 the Board entered into a contract for last year.
- 12 The characterization of the waste disposed is a
- 13 valuable information and tool for both local governments
- 14 and the Board in determining what kinds of policy focus
- 15 the Board may want to have and what kind of programs the
- 16 Board may want to focus on, as well as providing
- 17 information for local governments on the types of
- 18 programs that will be most effective in achieving the 50
- 19 percent diversion by focusing on the materials left in
- 20 the wastestream. Nancy Carr with the Waste Analysis
- 21 Branch will be giving the presentation.
- 22 MS. CARR: Good morning, Chairman Eaton and
- 23 Board Members. I'm here to tell you about the 1999
- 24 statewide waste disposal characterization study.
- 25 The purpose of the study was to collect

- 1 information on the types and amounts of materials still
- 2 being disposed in the state's wastestream. The study did
- 3 not include collecting information on materials being
- 4 diverted by recycling, composting and source reduction
- 5 programs.
- 6 Another purpose was to determine the amount of
- 7 RPPCs being disposed statewide, and this data will be
- 8 used to calculate the RPPC recycling rate, which is
- 9 required by statute. The results of the study will
- 10 update the Board's web database, and this is the first
- 11 statewide study done by the Board and the first time
- 12 information has been updated since 1990.
- 13 As you may remember, the 1990 studies were done
- 14 by local governments and they used different methods and
- 15 got varying results from their studies. These studies
- 16 were then compiled to estimate the statewide wastestream.
- 17 So this is the first time that statewide data is being
- 18 collected and we used the Board's standard method and
- 19 material type definitions.
- 20 As Lorraine mentioned, this data can be really
- 21 useful for statewide planning and policy decisions, and
- 22 it also can be used by local governments as proxy data to
- 23 help them understand their own wastestreams so they don't
- 24 have to go out and spend a lot of money collecting their
- 25 own data. The web database that's going to be updated is

- 1 the only one of its kind in the country and it's used by
- 2 solid waste planners in other states and also other
- 3 countries. And, of course, that database also supports
- 4 Board programs for working both with local governments
- 5 and businesses.
- Just to give you one example of what the web
- 7 database can use, this is a snapshot from the web page.
- 8 I know it's kind of hard to read, but one thing
- 9 jurisdictions can do with the database is identify the
- 10 business groups in their commercial sector that dispose
- 11 of the most waste and then they can start to look at the
- 12 materials disposed of by that type of business.
- This example is for restaurants, and as you
- 14 expect, food is the number one type being disposed of by
- 15 restaurants, but the number two type is corrugated
- 16 cardboard and that's a very recyclable material. So this
- 17 kind of information can help jurisdictions look at what's
- 18 disposed of by their commercial sector to help them
- 19 target programs. One of the main purposes of the study
- 20 was to get more information to update and expand this
- 21 database.
- 22 The study included a lot of firsts for data
- 23 collection for the Board. This was the first time we did
- 24 a statewide survey to break down the wastestream into the
- 25 residential, commercial and self-haul sectors. This is

- 1 the first time such extensive data was collected directly
- 2 from businesses. We sampled from their Dumpsters rather
- 3 than garbage trucks at the landfill, so that means we can
- 4 find out the types of materials coming directly from the
- 5 businesses. When you sample from garbage trucks, you get
- 6 all the commercial waste mixed together and you can't
- 7 really tell what's coming from where.
- 8 And we did sample from about 1,200 individual
- 9 businesses, so it's the most extensive set of this type
- 10 of data in the country, and this will provide an
- 11 excellent base for in-depth analysis to focus diversion
- 12 efforts, and since it's so extensive it really is unique
- 13 in the country and in the world.
- 14 A little bit on the time line, the contract was
- 15 awarded in September of 1998 to Cascadia Consulting
- 16 Group. It was augmented in December of '98 and the total
- 17 contract amount was \$635,700. Field data collection
- 18 occurred between February and September of last year, and
- 19 the final report was done in December of last year.
- 20 I also wanted to mention that this study was
- 21 really a cooperative effort. We were out collecting
- 22 field data all over the state, and we really wouldn't
- 23 have been able to do it without the help from solid waste
- 24 management companies, disposal sites, haulers, individual
- 25 businesses and local governments throughout the state.

- Because of the state's size and diversity, this
- 2 study really was a huge undertaking. We collected and
- 3 analyzed almost 1,700 samples statewide -- as I
- 4 mentioned, about 1,200 from individual businesses. We
- 5 did work at 25 sites throughout the state and we did
- 6 almost 3,700 vehicle surveys at those sites.
- 7 A few more details, we sampled in the winter
- 8 season and summer season of '99. We started out by
- 9 dividing the state into five regions. For example, the
- 10 central valley was one region, so we grouped similar
- 11 counties together. We did sampling and gate surveys at
- 12 five randomly picked sites in each region, and we did
- 13 generator sampling where we went to the businesses in
- 14 that area around the sites at two to three different
- 15 sites per region.
- We did 148 single-family disposal site samples
- 17 where we collected samples from garbage trucks that just
- 18 had collected from residences, so that's about 30 samples
- 19 per region; and 247 self-haul samples, about 50 per
- 20 region, and that means taking samples from people that
- 21 are hauling their own garbage to the landfill. They're
- 22 self-haulers rather than commercial haulers.
- We also did 80 multi-family residential samples,
- 24 and that's from apartment complexes, and that waste is
- 25 typically collected with the business waste. So in order

- 1 to get good data on that source of waste, you need to go
- 2 directly to the apartment complexes and sample from those
- 3 Dumpsters, just like we did with the businesses.
- 4 The 1,200 commercial generator samples were
- 5 divided among 26 different business groups, and we
- 6 collected 40 to 50 samples per group, and this is the
- 7 first time that we've had that many samples for all the
- 8 different business groups. We also conducted gate
- 9 surveys at all the sites to identify the sector of
- 10 origin -- residential, commercial or self-haul -- for
- 11 each load coming into the gate during the survey period.
- 12 Now for the eagerly awaited results. One of the
- 13 main things we had to do was determine rigid plastic
- 14 packaging containers disposed statewide, and we estimate
- 15 that to be about 377,000 tons or 1.06 percent of the
- 16 wastestream.
- 17 This is some information we have for the first
- 18 time statewide. It's the contribution of each sector to
- 19 the overall statewide wastestream. Commercial is about
- 20 49 percent, residential about 38, and self-haul about 13
- 21 percent of the overall wastestream.
- 22 Here's an example of other types of data that we
- 23 have. This is material classes in the overall disposed
- 24 wastestream. So this chart shows the breakdown into nine
- 25 main broad material categories. We also collected data

- 1 on 57 individual material types that end up being grouped
- 2 into these categories, as well as eight RPPC types.
- 3 So the number one category statewide is other
- 4 organic at about 35 percent, and that includes food
- 5 waste, yard waste, textiles and other miscellaneous
- 6 organic materials. The number two material type is paper
- 7 at about 30 percent, and the number three type is
- 8 construction and demolition materials, and these are
- 9 materials that we categorize as C&D waste from various
- 10 sources, not just from C&D sources, and that includes
- 11 materials like concrete, asphalt, gypsum board, lumber,
- 12 and other C&D materials.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Excuse me,
- 14 Mr. Chairman. I can't read that very well. It's very
- 15 difficult to read. Do you have a copy for us?
- MS. CARR: Yes, I do.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 18 That would be very helpful.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Two copies would be even
- 20 better.
- 21 MS. CARR: These charts are in the executive
- 22 summary that was distributed to the Board Members, I
- 23 think in January. It may be buried on your desk
- 24 somewhere.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Can this be made available

- 1 to us --
- 2 MS. CARR: Absolutely, yeah.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- a little later?
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: So how much was C&D?
- 5 MS. CARR: About 12 percent.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: 12 percent. Okay.
- 7 MS. CARR: If you want to know some of the other
- 8 types, I can read the numbers from my chart.
- 9 I have three other pie charts, so I'll just go
- 10 through them quickly since you're not going to be able to
- 11 see them too well. This is for the commercial sector of
- 12 the wastestream, and paper is the number one type at
- 13 about 39 percent. So it's a little bit higher than the
- 14 overall statewide waste disposed wastestream. The number
- 15 two type is other organic at about 31 percent, and again
- 16 that's food waste and yard waste. And the number three
- 17 type is plastic at about 10 percent.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Is that weight or volume?
- 19 MS. CARR: By weight, yeah.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Do you have ways to convert it
- 21 into volume?
- 22 MS. CARR: There is. The next chart is the
- 23 residential, and other organic is number one at 45
- 24 percent, which makes sense because of the food and yard
- 25 waste being disposed. Number two is paper at 27 percent.

- 1 And number three again is plastic at about 9 percent.
- 2 And the last chart is the C&D or the self-haul
- 3 wastestream, and this one, this pie chart is different
- 4 from the other ones in that C&D waste is the number one
- 5 type at about 51 percent, and that makes sense because
- 6 about one third of self-haul waste coming into facilities
- 7 is from C&D sources. The number two type is other
- 8 organic at about 21 percent, and the number three type is
- 9 metal at almost 11 percent.
- This gives you a little bit more detail on the
- 11 overall wastestream. This is getting into the detailed
- 12 material types now and this is the top ten material types
- 13 in the overall statewide wastestream. Number one is food
- 14 at about 16 percent. Number two is remainder composite
- 15 paper at about 10 percent, and that tends to be the
- 16 non-recyclable paper types. Number three is leaves and
- 17 grass at about 8 percent, and remainder composite organic
- 18 at about 7 percent.
- 19 So as you can see, there's still a lot of
- 20 material that potentially could be diverted that's being
- 21 disposed in the state's wastestream.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Question. "The top ten
- 23 material types in the overall statewide wastestream" is
- 24 the heading. That's the wastestream that is being
- 25 disposed of, not generated?

- 1 MS. CARR: Right.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: So maybe that heading needs
- 3 to say, "disposed of" as well because at some point you
- 4 put -- at some point did you put what is being disposed
- 5 and what is being diverted together to try to get an idea
- 6 of the 55 million tons?
- 7 MS. CARR: No, because we don't collect detailed
- 8 information on what's diverted.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And I don't have any
- 10 problem with that, I just think the words "disposed
- 11 of" needs to be on these so that people don't think --
- 12 MS. CARR: I think on the version -- this is
- 13 included in the executive summary, and I think on the
- 14 version that we're distributing it is. It just didn't
- 15 get put in here.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: With regard to that, Mr. Jones,
- 18 the follow-up question is we don't do what's being
- 19 diverted. Is that just something we didn't do or it's
- 20 not really -- we don't have the ability to do it or is it
- 21 something that we could do in the future?
- 22 MS. CARR: I think it's something we could do in
- 23 the future. Kind of the history is in the base year
- 24 studies that local governments did, they did collect
- 25 information on their diverted wastestream, but they had a

- 1 lot of problems doing it because it's hard to count
- 2 source reduction for one thing, and recyclers aren't
- 3 always willing to give their proprietary information. So
- 4 collecting information on the diverted waste is a lot
- 5 more difficult.
- 6 When we developed our method because of changes
- 7 in statute in '92, it was to focus on the disposed
- 8 wastestream. That was AB 2494 in 1992.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: I understood that, I just was
- 10 wondering if in the future it would be beneficial, not as
- 11 part of the characterization study but if we looked at
- 12 it. I understand what you're saying.
- MS. CARR: I think it's very possible and we're
- 14 always getting requests for diversion information that we
- 15 don't have a whole lot of. If that's something the Board
- 16 would want to do in the future, I think we could do it.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any other questions? Comments?
- 18 MS. CARR: We actually have two other smaller
- 19 studies that we're going to have data on in the next
- 20 couple of months. We're going to be getting 170
- 21 additional business composition samples in a study we're
- 22 doing in Santa Clara County and we're also going to be
- 23 getting at least a hundred and the potential for several
- 24 hundred more data points on business disposal rates. And
- 25 what that helps us determine is how much waste businesses

- 1 typically dispose. That's an important information, as
- 2 well as the types of material they typically dispose.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Can I ask a question with
- 4 regard to an issue that was raised? I think it was
- 5 either raised by Ms. Moulton-Patterson, but I think it
- 6 was Senator Roberti with multi-family, apartments. In
- 7 other words, do we have the ability by what's in here to
- 8 determine what was put into the wastestream from
- 9 apartments versus single-family? I know we have it for
- 10 residential versus commercial, but is there a subset?
- MS. CARR: Yes, we did do that. I didn't
- 12 include that in the presentation, but we do have
- 13 composition and amounts from the multi-family sector and
- 14 the single-family sector, and those two put together are
- 15 the overall residential, which is with the information I
- 16 included.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: One of the things that we're
- 18 looking at in knowing at least that we've heard not only
- 19 from Board Members but local governments, is how hard it
- 20 is, property owners and tenants and what have you, but if
- 21 we're able to identify with some real reliable data what
- 22 it is that they're actually putting in, we might be able
- 23 to attack at least a part of that and maybe be able to
- 24 sell the apartment owners as well as the apartment
- 25 dwellers on a program.

- 1 Obviously, yard waste is probably not part of a
- 2 great deal because they have other landscape which would
- 3 probably be included in the self-haul for multi-family,
- 4 but in an apartment you tend to pick up to-go food a lot
- 5 more, all kinds of different kinds of materials. So it
- 6 would just be kind of -- maybe the next time you come
- 7 back you can report to us and look at those subsets for
- 8 informational purposes.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Very good.
- 10 MS. CARR: I actually have just been handed the
- 11 multi-family residential composition. What we don't have
- 12 but what we can do is kind of lay the multi-family and
- 13 single-family side-by-side so you can compare if you
- 14 like, but we do have the multi-family data.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I just want to -- Nancy and
- 18 Lorraine have been working on this thing for two years.
- 19 Unfortunately we've got new Board Members that may -- I
- 20 think you guys kind of sold yourselves short in this just
- 21 from the standpoint -- for a little bit of history, if
- 22 you don't mind, to put this in some kind of context.
- 23 We had been working off of waste
- 24 characterization numbers that were back from 1990's and
- 25 dealing with the plastics and dealing with other things.

- 1 We really didn't have good data on figuring out how much
- 2 of this material was going into landfills as opposed to
- 3 being recycled. And the Board took the advantage -- took
- 4 advantage of the idea that we needed to really get an
- 5 idea of what was going into the landfills, and it was a
- 6 monumental event and a monumental task to try to get a
- 7 snapshot of the state of California as far as what kind
- 8 of waste was going into those landfills so we had a
- 9 better idea of what to attack as far as the strategic
- 10 plan and to help people, not so much that material that
- 11 was being diverted but that material that was still being
- 12 thrown away, and to combine it with the RPPC plastics
- 13 issues.
- 14 And when this contract -- this was so
- 15 specialized that -- normally we always want a minimum of
- 16 three vendors to bid on something like this. We had
- 17 actually made it a discussion that there may only be one
- 18 to two vendors in the whole state of California that
- 19 could even do this and they may end up working together
- 20 to do it. And as it turned out, only one proposal came
- 21 forward and those people did combine to work to do this
- 22 project. That's the magnitude of what this was going to
- 23 do.
- 24 I think that the information is critical for our
- 25 focusing. I think that when you live with a project for

- 1 two years every day, dealing with people, trying to cull
- 2 through garbage, that I would like to see either
- 3 individual briefings or another item come forward, but I
- 4 think even individual briefings gives everybody the
- 5 opportunity to ask a lot more questions, to have this
- 6 material that you're putting up on the screen in a form
- 7 so we can look through it.
- 8 And I know I'd like to get a little more
- 9 understanding of a couple of those items, and I think it
- 10 would be beneficial. In another three or four weeks,
- 11 we're going to have another member that is not going to
- 12 have the historical perspective of -- you know, I feel
- 13 for staff because they want to get through this stuff and
- 14 sometimes they don't realize that we don't live with
- 15 these items every day. We're not as engaged -- we're
- 16 engaged, but we don't understand all the detail, and I
- 17 don't want you to dismiss the incredible amount of work
- 18 you that you guys did because this was a phenomenal piece
- 19 of work that's going to be the basis of what other
- 20 states, other -- the whole United States is going to rely
- 21 on some of this information as a basis.
- 22 But I think I would feel more comfortable if we
- 23 really got into the detail of a lot of this stuff in
- 24 individual briefings or something, where people had the
- 25 opportunity to really ask questions and get a better

- 1 handle on some of this stuff.
- 2 I don't know how the other Board Members feel
- 3 about that, but I think some of that historical
- 4 perspective needed to be part of this item because this
- 5 is a -- this is truly something that this Board can be --
- 6 can feel very, very good about, that they were able to
- 7 accomplish this. And you guys should feel very good
- 8 about it. It's valuable information.
- 9 MS. VAN KEKERIX: We'd be happy to provide you
- 10 with individual briefings, if you would like, and even a
- 11 tour of the web site so that you can go through and see
- 12 the way that the data can be used. And we'd be happy to
- 13 do that for you individually or if you would want us to
- 14 come back with an item.
- We had been told to give a 10- or 15-minute item
- 16 today, but we'd be very happy to go into detail because
- 17 we have a lot of information available.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very
- 19 much and thank you, Mr. Jones. I would certainly be
- 20 interested.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: Absolutely. This is probably
- 22 more of an appropriate question for Ms. Fish. I can't
- 23 let her off the hook, so to speak.
- 24 (Laughter)
- 25 MS. FISH: I get that a lot. Come on now.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: How was this information, this
- 2 characterization study, shared with the rest of the staff
- 3 in the divisions here at the Board? Because obviously
- 4 everyone does their job, but I know it can be shared as a
- 5 web site and all of the other things. Somehow all this
- 6 information, all of our divisions or all of our
- 7 departments, all of our subsections would utilize this
- 8 information. And I know that -- has it been done in the
- 9 past where we have like at our all-staff meetings a
- 10 presentation by the staff as to some of that, or how do
- 11 we integrate it to the whole? The sum of the parts make
- 12 it a whole, so the information happens to be --
- MS. FISH: I think this is the first formal
- 14 presentation, that it was distributed in the executive
- 15 summary and that we know that it is on the web site. So
- 16 maybe what we need to do is have some individual
- 17 briefings, have this information presented at an
- 18 all-staff meeting, as well as then come back to the Board
- 19 again, maybe in a couple months, and go through the
- 20 information at one time so everybody has the ability to
- 21 discuss it and get all their questions answered, as well
- 22 as become more knowledgeable.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think if you could, that
- 24 would be helpful. Maybe there's other questions that
- 25 would be prompted that we haven't looked at because as

- 1 Mr. Jones says, they live with it every day.
- 2 MS. FISH: We could distribute the presentation
- 3 in advance so that way people could look through it and
- 4 then come prepared with questions.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I think, too, if you look
- 7 at your 1990 generation studies, and while this is an
- 8 apples and oranges, it should tell a story that in 1990,
- 9 paper, metal, those types of things were consistently
- 10 being thrown away or part of the wastestream. And now
- 11 when we look at the thing that is disposed of the most,
- 12 it's food, so that you could show the impacts just by
- 13 virtue that those materials aren't ending up in the
- 14 landfills of those diversion programs. You know what I'm
- 15 saying?
- 16 I think that would be a -- really a stark
- 17 comparison through a graph to show what it was when this
- 18 state was lucky to even recycle close to 9 percent of the
- 19 wastestream and what it is today at 37 percent of the
- 20 wastestream and how that -- that food has now moved up to
- 21 the number one item going into landfills where before
- 22 there were three other -- there were three other items
- 23 that were ahead of it. I think that is an important
- 24 thing to see.
- 25 MS. CARR: Actually, the 90-99 comparison I'm

- 1 working on right now.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I should have known better.
- 3 Sorry.
- 4 MS. CARR: And I did want to say, as Lorraine
- 5 mentioned, we had been told a 10- to 15-minute
- 6 presentation, and I'd be happy to talk about this for
- 7 hours, so be careful what you ask for.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Hey, this is important
- 9 stuff.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, and
- 12 we really do appreciate your -- all the information
- 13 you're giving us. How will this -- I do have one
- 14 question. How will this be shared with local
- 15 jurisdictions?
- 16 MS. CARR: The easiest way is through our web
- 17 site.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: And they'll
- 19 know -- I mean we'll send something out? How do we let
- 20 them know?
- 21 MS. CARR: A lot of times the IMB, our web unit,
- 22 will put flashes on the Board's main page directing
- 23 people to what's new, so we could do something like that.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay.
- 25 MS. CARR: I don't know if doing any mailing

- 1 would be as effective or you know, but --
- 2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: It seems like
- 3 it would be really important to let them know.
- 4 Thank you.
- 5 MS. CARR: I was just reminded our division
- 6 sends out a quarterly newsletter on what's coming up and
- 7 we're going to have an article on the results in our next
- 8 Infocycling Newsletter.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very
- 10 much.
- MS. CARR: I actually have a couple more slides.
- 12 One of the things this data set is going to let
- 13 us do is in-depth data analysis now that we have this
- 14 huge body of data that really has never existed before.
- 15 I just wanted to relate this to the statistical expert
- 16 contract that you approved yesterday. Having that
- 17 statistician will help us to do some in-depth analysis
- 18 and also he can train staff to do analysis.
- 19 One of the things that I'm really hoping to do
- 20 with that contract is look at other data that exists from
- 21 other studies. Like the City of Ventura and Santa Cruz
- 22 County have done generator studies and collected similar
- 23 data, and I think there's about another thousand data
- 24 points available that we can add to our database really
- 25 to develop the most accurate data possible.

- In conclusion, one of the main things we found
- 2 out was there was a significant amount of divertable
- 3 material still being disposed, but now we have an updated
- 4 comprehensive set of data that really can help us
- 5 understand the wastestream, what's being disposed and
- 6 where it comes from. This detailed information can help
- 7 target efforts at the statewide level, as well as help
- 8 local governments look at their own wastestreams.
- 9 Are there any other questions?
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you very, very much. We
- 11 look forward to working with you in individual briefings
- 12 as well as all-staff and other meetings.
- 13 I have one speaker slip from Mr. Mike Mohajer
- 14 from L.A. County Public Works who would like to speak on
- 15 this item.
- 16 MR. MOHAJER: Good morning, Mr. Chair. My name
- 17 is Mike Mohajer, L.A. County Public Works, and I'm also
- 18 staff of the L.A. County Integrated Waste Management Task
- 19 Force.
- 20 Ms. Moulton-Patterson raised the specific
- 21 question I was going to ask, but I just want to first
- 22 congratulate the Board and the Board staff for doing this
- 23 waste disposal characterization. As I was looking at the
- 24 monitor, I think it's excellent work and we need to get
- 25 the word out to the local government.

- So from that perspective, I believe it would be
- 2 good if the staff would make local presentations on the
- 3 result of these tests, and I would like to offer our
- 4 facility and advertise and invite the cities in L.A.
- 5 County to come to a meeting that we can probably provide
- 6 an hour or two discussion of these results so it could be
- 7 better used by the local government because I think it's
- 8 excellent work and I want to congratulate you.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: If you can, Ms. Fish, maybe
- 10 what we should just do is look at what we have coming up
- 11 north, south and central and other places, and just
- 12 integrate that as part of it and coordinate with
- 13 Mr. Mohajer in his area and coordinate with whomever
- 14 might be in San Diego or the central valley and set up
- 15 some dates to do that.
- MR. MOHAJER: And we will do the advertisement
- 17 of that.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Good.
- 19 MR. MOHAJER: Thank you.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. That's Item Number 16.
- 21 We have one remaining item, but I understand
- 22 we're having some materials copied. They're here? Okay.
- 23 Item Number 17, discussion and preliminary
- 24 analysis of waste disposed and programs implemented by
- 25 the residential, commercial and governmental sectors.

- 1 Thank you.
- 2 MS. VAN KEKERIX: This item was requested by
- 3 Senator Roberti at a previous meeting. He wanted to have
- 4 more information on what was happening with disposal and
- 5 diversion by various sectors and Tim Hall in the Waste
- 6 Analysis Branch will be making the presentation. It ties
- 7 very well with the characterization information that you
- 8 just heard.
- 9 MR. HALL: Excuse me while I get settled.
- 10 Good morning, Chairman Eaton, Board Members.
- 11 I'm Tim Hall from Diversion, Planning and Local
- 12 Assistance.
- 13 At the January 2000 board meeting, the Board
- 14 requested that staff return to the April board meeting to
- 15 discuss the impact of state agencies and the commercial
- 16 and multi-family sectors on the wastestream. I'm here
- 17 today to present staff's preliminary analysis of these
- 18 issues.
- 19 First I'd like to talk about the non-residential
- 20 sectors. We've divided them into three separate
- 21 sectors -- commercial, industrial and government.
- 22 Generally the commercial sector consists of businesses
- 23 that sell goods and products or provide services. You
- 24 can see from the chart that about 77 percent of statewide
- 25 employment is in the commercial sector.

- The commercial sector is the largest source of
- 2 disposal statewide. I'm sorry. That last slide was 77
- 3 percent of employment. I don't know if I said "disposal"
- 4 or "employment."
- 5 Now I'm going to move on to disposal. It's
- 6 approximately 45 percent of the statewide disposal and
- 7 about 78 percent of non-residential disposal. With the
- 8 disposal rate of about nine pounds per employee per day,
- 9 the commercial sector has the greatest impact on
- 10 non-disposal rates in addition to overall disposal.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Nine pounds per person per
- 12 day is the commercial sector?
- MR. HALL: That's the commercial sector, yes.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay.
- MR. HALL: The local impact, as well as local --
- 16 as well as disposal rates in the commercial sector depend
- 17 on the types of businesses in a community because
- 18 different types of businesses have different per employee
- 19 disposal rates.
- 20 Staff found that there's insufficient to
- 21 determine relationships between local disposal and
- 22 diversion rates and the number or types of commercial
- 23 programs in the PARIS database. It is also important to
- 24 note that PARIS does not always differentiate between
- 25 programs that target commercial versus other sectors.

- 1 The reason for this is that local governments are not
- 2 required to report this level of detail to the Board.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And that's because they're
- 4 fluid; right? They're always changing to deal with the
- 5 wastestream as it changes.
- 6 MR. HALL: Yes, but we don't require them to
- 7 report annually on which sector each program targets.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Gotcha.
- 9 MR. HALL: Moving on to the industrial sector,
- 10 generally the industrial sector consists of businesses
- 11 that make products or assemble things. This sector makes
- 12 up about 18 percent of statewide employment.
- 13 Approximately 10 percent of statewide disposal
- 14 comes from the industrial sector. The industrial sector
- 15 also has a per employee disposal rate of about nine
- 16 pounds per employee per day. Again, I want to stress
- 17 that PARIS programs -- or jurisdictions do not
- 18 differentiate between commercial and industrial programs
- 19 when they report to us. I'm sorry?
- 20 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Which programs?
- 21 MR. HALL: When jurisdictions report to the
- 22 Board annually, they don't differentiate between
- 23 commercial and industrial when they report their
- 24 programs. So therefore, PARIS does not track that
- 25 information. PARIS is our program database waste

- 1 diversion programs. Sorry about that.
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I didn't think you were
- 3 talking about France.
- 4 (Laughter)
- 5 MR. HALL: That would be nice for us.
- 6 Now I'll talk about the government sector. This
- 7 sector includes federal, state and local government
- 8 employees, and approximately 5 percent of statewide
- 9 employment is in the government sector. Again, I have a
- 10 chart that shows the percentage of employment that is in
- 11 the government sector.
- 12 Approximately 2 percent of disposal statewide
- 13 comes from the government sector. With the disposal rate
- 14 of about seven pounds per employee per day, the
- 15 government sector has the least impact on disposal
- 16 statewide except for mobile homes. However, this varies
- 17 by region, county and jurisdiction. Staff found that
- 18 these variations may be due to local prisons, colleges
- 19 and universities, and large projects such as Caltrans
- 20 maintenance and road work.
- 21 We found insufficient data to determine
- 22 relationships between disposal and diversion rates and
- 23 PARIS program data. Government sector disposal rates
- 24 have little impact on non-residential disposal. Any
- 25 variation may be due again to the location of prisons,

- 1 colleges and universities, and major projects. We have
- 2 no data yet on state agency impacts. We should have that
- 3 data in databases this summer.
- 4 Now I'll talk briefly about the residential
- 5 sector. We've divided this sector into three
- 6 categories -- single-family, multi-family and mobile
- 7 homes.
- 8 Single-family residences contribute
- 9 approximately 30 percent of statewide disposal. This is
- 10 the second largest source of disposal statewide, second
- 11 only to commercial. Residents in the single-family homes
- 12 dispose about three pounds per person per day.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And how much do they
- 14 generate? They dispose three pounds per person a day.
- MR. HALL: I would have to look that up. I want
- 16 to say between four and four and a half, but I'm not
- 17 sure.
- 18 Once again, because jurisdictions are not
- 19 required to specify single- versus multi-family programs
- 20 when they report, we don't know whether programs listed
- 21 in the PARIS database target single-family, multi-family
- 22 or both. Therefore, staff is unable to determine
- 23 relationships between disposal and diversion rates and
- 24 the percentage of single-family dwellings in local
- 25 jurisdictions.

- 1 Approximately 12 percent of statewide disposal
- 2 comes from the multi-family residences. It's about 20
- 3 percent of residential disposal. This wastestream is
- 4 often picked up with and included in the commercial
- 5 wastestream. We found that they also dispose about three
- 6 pound per person per day.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And that's because they are
- 8 probably serviced by front loader containers that are on
- 9 a commercial route.
- 10 MR. HALL: Yes.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Picking up stores and stuff
- 12 in a front loader that picks up three, four, five yards
- 13 at a time? Thank you.
- 14 MR. HALL: We were unable to determine
- 15 relationships between disposal and diversion rate and the
- 16 percentage of residences that are in multi-family units
- 17 as well. Once again, because jurisdictions are not
- 18 required to designate programs as multi-family, PARIS
- 19 does not have data on multi-family programs.
- 20 Finally, mobile homes contribute about 1.5
- 21 percent of statewide disposal. They also have a disposal
- 22 rate of about three pounds per person per day.
- 23 I'm going to talk about conclusions now. First,
- 24 we found that local wastestreams vary from the statewide
- 25 patterns and trends. They also vary from year to year,

- 1 depending on changes in the makeup of businesses,
- 2 Caltrans projects, et cetera.
- 3 Another conclusion is that we have very limited
- 4 information regarding local disposal patterns. The 1999
- 5 statewide disposal characterization study which was just
- 6 presented does not include data at the local level. Our
- 7 analysis attempted to use characterization data to
- 8 estimate local data, but further analysis is required.
- 9 Once again, state agency data is due in July of
- 10 2000, and hopefully this will help us determine local
- 11 impacts of state agencies. As I mentioned several times,
- 12 jurisdictions report limited program information and,
- 13 therefore, PARIS is limited mainly to qualitative
- 14 information that tracks whether a jurisdiction has a
- 15 program but it does not track the level of participation
- 16 or implementation or such as the percentage of population
- 17 or the percentage of businesses served.
- 18 It also does not track programs by sector.
- 19 Residential programs are not split into single- versus
- 20 multi-family. Commercial programs do not specify whether
- 21 they are commercial or industrial and sometimes even
- 22 overlap with government and residential.
- 23 We also have limited data on residential and
- 24 non-residential sectors. For instance, we had to
- 25 estimate the population in single- and multi-family and

- 1 mobile homes using 1990 census data because no one seems
- 2 to track this data any longer.
- 3 We have issues with disposal data.
- 4 Jurisdictions estimated in their base years the amount of
- 5 waste that was residential. Some of those base years are
- 6 ten years old now and the residential percentages might
- 7 have changed since then. When staff developed the
- 8 disposal reporting regulations, we tried to include
- 9 reporting that would have yielded ongoing estimates of
- 10 contributions by each sector, but industry and the
- 11 counties felt this was too burdensome and not practical.
- 12 The Disposal Reporting System has some local allocation
- 13 issues that have to be ironed out.
- 14 And then on the business side of things, we have
- 15 several sources of information on the types of businesses
- 16 and the numbers of employees in each those businesses,
- 17 but these sources all have different methods of
- 18 estimating and, therefore, they all disagree.
- 19 Finally, I'd like to take this opportunity to
- 20 make a few recommendations. First, state agency data
- 21 will be in databases this summer and this may help us
- 22 with our analysis of local wastestreams. PARIS needs to
- 23 be revised to include quantitative information such as
- 24 the level of participation or implementation, including
- 25 the percentage of the population served, the types and

- 1 percentages of business targeted by the programs.
- We also need to differentiate between sectors.
- 3 We will begin working on the statistics contract which
- 4 was awarded by the Board yesterday. That contract will
- 5 examine how different economic and demographic factors
- 6 influence waste disposal and generation. We'll also use
- 7 that contract to analyze the data from the 1999 disposal
- 8 characterization study at the local level.
- 9 We'll be examining Disposal Reporting System
- 10 allocation issues such as whether the quarterly week-long
- 11 survey frequencies are statistically valid at all
- 12 landfills. We'll look at anomalies in disposal reporting
- 13 data like uncharacteristic spikes or dips in local
- 14 disposal tonnage, and we'll look at trends and waste
- 15 sheds in the Disposal Reporting System.
- 16 We will also look at different sources of
- 17 business information, looking for similarities as well as
- 18 differences in the data sets. Finally, we'll look at per
- 19 resident and per employee disposal rates as indicators of
- 20 progress in addition to diversion rates.
- 21 And that concludes my presentation. Are there
- 22 any questions?
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Questions? Senator Roberti.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: First, Mr. Chairman, I
- 25 would like to say this is an excellent report and I

- 1 appreciate it very much and it will be very helpful to
- 2 me.
- 3 I hope at a future meeting -- I'm not asking for
- 4 it now -- that we have the diversion data to the extent
- 5 that we can have it from, I guess, base year adjustments.
- 6 MR. HALL: We do have some of that data here.
- 7 MS. VAN KEKERIX: We did develop some
- 8 preliminary diversion program data which we can give you.
- 9 This is taken from a sampling of the new generation
- 10 studies.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Very good.
- 12 MS. VAN KEKERIX: It isn't going to be all
- 13 jurisdictions on a statewide basis because we have a
- 14 limited number of new base year generation studies.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: So this is a sampling of
- 16 them.
- 17 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Right.
- 18 MR. SITTS: And basically -- John Sitts, Waste
- 19 Analysis Branch. One of the things that you can see from
- 20 this is that in the far right column, there's a reliance
- 21 on the different sectors. There's just a number. The
- 22 higher that number is, the more they rely on the
- 23 residential sector to have more diversion. When you get
- 24 to one, that means that it's a pretty balanced effort
- 25 between the residential sector and the commercial sector

- 1 based on the size of those sectors as well. And then the
- 2 lower number you get, that means they're relying more on
- 3 the commercial sector for diversion rather than on the
- 4 residential sector.
- 5 In this sampling of approximately 40
- 6 jurisdictions, about ten of them rely more heavily on the
- 7 residential sector and about 30 of them rely more heavily
- 8 on the commercial sector for the diversion.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Is that based on a
- 10 relationship to the amount of waste generation?
- 11 MR. SITTS: Yes. So if you had half of your
- 12 wastestream was residential and half of your wastestream
- 13 was commercial, you would expect that half of your
- 14 diversion was residential and half was commercial.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: You would get a one in
- 16 that case.
- 17 MR. SITTS: Yes. In that case you get one. In
- 18 the other columns it lists what percentage of the
- 19 generation is residential and then what percentage of the
- 20 generation is non-residential, and then also the
- 21 percentage of diversion that's residential and not
- 22 residential diversion as well.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: This is an incredible --

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Chart.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- chart because I think
- 3 this could be used for a tool for a show-me to an awful
- 4 lot of local jurisdictions, and one of the issues we have
- 5 is you know, the city that's 10 percent residential and
- 6 90 percent commercial and puts a curbside recycling
- 7 program and doesn't attack the commercial sector. This
- 8 would be the kind of thing that you would want to really
- 9 let them understand, and I think this is a great chart.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: It's so good that to the
- 11 extent that you can give us all the jurisdictions, I'd
- 12 like to see it now.
- 13 (Laughter)
- 14 MR. SITTS: As part of the new base years
- 15 coming forward?
- 16 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Especially as Mr. Jones
- 17 was alluding to, when they come before us wanting --
- 18 what's our word? Variances, extensions, just a referral
- 19 to this and then have them explain would be very helpful.
- 20 MR. HALL: I think this combined with the per
- 21 capita or per employee disposal rates makes some
- 22 interesting data.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Just a comment
- 25 along those lines, Mr. Chairman. Just to take it from my

- 1 own experience in Huntington Beach, you know, I remember
- 2 really, really certainly leaning on the residents and on
- 3 the haulers, but I don't remember anyone ever saying hey,
- 4 we've really got to go after -- well, it was -- I forget
- 5 what it was. It's Boeing now -- or the Waterfront Hilton
- 6 or any of those and we just didn't do it.
- We look at this and it hits you in the face how
- 8 unfair it is. I don't know where we go from there, but
- 9 it really is not fair.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think one of the places we
- 11 could go is perhaps to follow up next month, which we
- 12 didn't have this month, we're going to be taking up the
- 13 extension, 1066 principals and so on and so forth.
- 14 Perhaps staff could come back to see what we can get, as
- 15 Senator Roberti said, for expanding it, what would it
- 16 take. Go ahead.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Is multi-family included
- 18 in residential?
- 19 MS. VAN KEKERIX: What the jurisdictions have
- 20 done on the new generation studies is they have tended to
- 21 lump all of residential together. So multi-family as a
- 22 subsection of residential has not been separated out by
- 23 most of the jurisdictions.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Because we'll have to ask
- 25 that question. You may not be able to get that

- 1 information then based on what you have, but to the
- 2 extent that there is residential performance, it could
- 3 be, it could be, strictly single-family performance and
- 4 the apartment houses aren't being asked to do as much and
- 5 sort of getting lost in the statistics. This is my
- 6 suspicion. I could be totally, a hundred percent wrong,
- 7 but I guess my suspicions are just strictly borne out by
- 8 where I live when I see the blue cans coming out of the
- 9 residences and the apartments don't have to do anything.
- Maybe there's another method, but see, I think
- 11 commercial, they do have the bottom line benefit of once
- 12 they're educated in the fact they can cut their expenses
- 13 down, they may perform, but I don't know if we have
- 14 anything comparable as far as --
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: No one cuts the rent.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: You don't cut the rent.
- 17 You don't cut the gardener, I think. He's still going to
- 18 mow the lawn.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: And cities and counties don't
- 20 cut the service charge that they have for their public
- 21 contracts because they're fixed.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: To the extent we could
- 23 find that information, it would be great. And I don't
- 24 know if you can and I'm not faulting you if you don't
- 25 have it.

- 1 MR. HALL: That's one of the revisions that
- 2 we're recommending for PARIS is to differentiate between
- 3 sectors and then to give us the percentage of their
- 4 implementation or participation, so to not only say that
- 5 we have a residential curbside program that could be
- 6 single- or multi-family, but to split that and say yes,
- 7 we have a single-family curbside program, we also have a
- 8 multi-family on-site program, and this is the percentage
- 9 of apartment dwellings that get that service.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Chair, I
- 12 was just wondering. Have we, as a state board, or to
- 13 your knowledge have jurisdictions or counties met with
- 14 the apartment owners association to try to let them know
- 15 that we think this is really important that they
- 16 participate also?
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: I'm not aware of any dealings
- 18 with individual Board Members. The staff may have had in
- 19 their own as projects have arisen, but I see some nods
- 20 and shakes of the head, but we have a record that is oral
- 21 in nature. So Ms. Morgan, if you would care to comment
- 22 on that.
- 23 MS. MORGAN: Cara Morgan, Office of Local
- 24 Assistance. Thank you.
- 25 Board Member Moulton-Patterson, yes, we have

- 1 actually formed a partnership with BOMA, which is --
- 2 excuse me, Senator, if I screw up on this acronym, but
- 3 it's the Building and Office Managers Association of
- 4 California.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Business Office Managers
- 6 Association.
- 7 MS. MORGAN: Building and Office Management
- 8 Association, something like that. Anyway, they're the
- 9 folks that manage apartment buildings, large office
- 10 complexes and such, so more of the multi-family and large
- 11 office sector.
- 12 Our staff have gone out to some of their
- 13 statewide regional meetings and made presentations and
- 14 formed some partnerships. So I think in the future
- 15 there's an opportunity for us to possibly have some Board
- 16 Members maybe make a presentation at some of their
- 17 statewide conferences. I think there's an opportunity in
- 18 the future to continue those relationships with their
- 19 organizations.
- 20 The feedback we received from BOMA, this
- 21 management group, was very positive. They were very
- 22 excited to learn more about how they could implement
- 23 waste diversion programs into their multi-family
- 24 complexes and business office sectors.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I think that's

- 1 great you're doing that and I know there is a large
- 2 California Apartment Owners Association and also a Mobile
- 3 Home Park Owners Association, you know. So we could
- 4 maybe further those efforts.
- 5 MR. MORGAN: And maybe we can follow up because
- 6 I don't think we've actually done anything with the
- 7 mobile home sector at all. I think there's opportunity
- 8 there.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Perhaps I can make this
- 10 recommendation, that GSMOA, Golden State Mobile Home
- 11 Owners Association, perhaps maybe we can do this. Would
- 12 you like a letter prepared, Ms. Moulton-Patterson, for
- 13 your signature or the Board Members' signature, and what
- 14 we could go through is at least in the statewide lobbies
- 15 some of us have information as to the apartment owners
- 16 association, inviting them to come to the Board and have
- 17 a discussion on this or individual. That's one way to
- 18 approach, to start dialogue and help the staff out.
- 19 That's one way.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: One way. Maybe -- excuse
- 21 me.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I was just
- 23 going to differentiate between that ${\tt GSMOA}$, Golden State.
- 24 That's the people that live there, but the owners are a
- 25 totally different group that we might want to --

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Absolutely.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: As you might
- 3 know.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Maybe a --
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: One without the other, we'd be
- 6 in more trouble.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Maybe a softer way of
- 8 doing it would be that we're going to have a discussion
- 9 on multi-unit diversion, we would like your input. Just
- 10 come in and have a discussion. The other sounds more
- 11 like a summons, which I don't have a problem with
- 12 personally, but you know.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: Keep those cards and letters
- 15 coming. When is the multi-family discussion? Have we
- 16 set it?
- 17 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: No. No, but we ought to.
- 18 We ought to.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: That way we could do the
- 20 kinder, softer, gentler approach.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And we should do this,
- 22 the multi-family.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I think this, you know --
- 24 it's different in a lot of different jurisdictions, and I
- 25 think it's a good tool for TIA to use as to what those

- 1 sectors really are as far as the amount of people that
- 2 are living within each jurisdiction, but I know that -- I
- 3 think Riordan came out not too long ago in the City of
- 4 L.A., even with their 48 percent or whatever, that he
- 5 wanted -- he's instructed their staff to start working
- 6 with the apartment owners in the City of L.A. to start --
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Right.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- figuring out --
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And the reason for that
- 10 is he discovered, as many other jurisdictions discover,
- 11 is the reason why you have to have landfills like
- 12 Sunshine Canyon, which is causing him an enormous
- 13 headache, is that we aren't looking to the entire
- 14 wastestream --
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: -- for diversion.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: When I was giving the
- 19 WRAP award to the Gene Autry museum, one of Mr. Riordan's
- 20 reps was there on the day -- this was the date of the
- 21 city council permitting Sunshine, and all of a sudden,
- 22 "You're on the Waste Board?" "Of course I'm on the Waste
- 23 Board. That's why you're here and I'm here." He said,
- 24 "You know, I think we should do more about multi-family
- 25 diversion," because simply when the politics get hot, it

- 1 gets hot and --
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Sure.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: -- I think they're
- 4 escaping more than commercial are --
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Absolutely.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: -- escaping, if
- 7 commercial is escaping at all. The year and a half I've
- 8 been here, I do not recall -- this is not our fault
- 9 simply because one comes into us --
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I don't recall any permit
- 12 from the local area or anything, any discussion from the
- 13 local area on what they're doing in the multi-family area
- 14 because I don't think anybody is doing too much of
- 15 anything, is my suspicion.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: A couple of the base year
- 17 adjustments we've seen have had multi-family marked that
- 18 they've had programs. A lot of them had it marked and no
- 19 programs. I think that if we're going to -- you know, I
- 20 don't care how we're going to do this thing. I think
- 21 it's important to do, but I'd like to see similar to
- 22 maybe some of the discussions where we had panels. I
- 23 don't care what the format is, but a huge piece of this
- 24 is local ordinances.
- 25 Part of the problem in some jurisdictions or

- 1 maybe some of the excuses in some jurisdictions is
- 2 nowhere to put bins, which becomes a physical problem,
- 3 but it also -- if you've got local governments that are
- 4 willing to make changes in their ordinances and stuff,
- 5 they can help facilitate that.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And I am told there --
- 7 and another problem is people just vandalizing or dumping
- 8 in the bins, but I'm told that there are bins that can be
- 9 constructed in such a way that can control a chunk of
- 10 this. At any rate, we should be more conversant
- 11 ourselves on whose out there.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I agree. I agree.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Well, you just
- 15 suggested that maybe when we're in southern California in
- 16 August, we might convene something like this. So maybe
- 17 staff could look into our options.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: The Senator had talked about
- 19 multi-family. It's an area --
- 20 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: When is the -- when is
- 21 it? August? I would like to gear it toward the August
- 22 meeting that we have a multi-family discussion.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: And then at that time and in
- 24 the meantime we could work with you, with our individual
- 25 offices of people we know in the area. I know for

- 1 instance in Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Apartment Owners
- 2 Association is a huge organization, everywhere in Orange
- 3 County, and all of them. We could go there and invite
- 4 some northerners.
- 5 Without any problem, we can direct staff that on
- 6 the August agenda we would have a discussion of
- 7 multi-family housing and their efforts at diversion and
- 8 so on and so forth.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just one quick thing is
- 12 that the -- if they're identified in the SRRE that
- 13 they're doing multi-family and stuff, I think that that
- 14 in my mind lets you know how that stuff should be split
- 15 out.
- 16 I think if we start getting into number
- 17 crunching to determine -- and one of the reasons that I
- 18 worry about that -- I like seeing as part of the SRRE
- 19 multi-family residential, but to try to get the amount of
- 20 information that you would need to be able to
- 21 substantiate how much of that waste, it may be irrelevant
- 22 and it's going to be hard to pick up because those
- 23 apartment buildings that need to have toters or, you
- 24 know, the 32-gallon garbage can are going to be picked up
- 25 with a different type of truck than those jurisdictions

- 1 that can have a front loader go in. Those are
- 2 historically commercial, and I think to try to go down
- 3 that road of determining what percentage of the
- 4 wastestream is being picked up commercially and
- 5 residentially, do we care?
- 6 It will give you such a nightmare and the local
- 7 jurisdictions that they will be able to call us bean
- 8 counters, and I think that having the SRRE say that they
- 9 do these programs and what percentages of the residential
- 10 is multi-family would give us -- would give me, anyway, a
- 11 feeling of understanding that wastestream.
- 12 I just throw that out to other Board Members
- 13 because of the way that this stuff is collected. It may
- 14 be information that we would never get and we would be
- 15 spending a lot of time, effort to actually figure it out,
- 16 if you know what I mean. It doesn't hurt.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I quess what I
- 18 would want is, as one Board Member is, just to kind of
- 19 bring the parties to the table --
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Absolutely.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: -- to explore
- 22 how we can get this done --
- 23 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Yeah.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: -- you know,
- 25 not -- not with adding huge local problems --

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Yeah.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: -- or huge
- 3 problems to the haulers but just to find out what we're
- 4 not doing and what we could do better.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: No, I absolutely want to do
- 6 that. I just didn't want us to get hung up on does it
- 7 get picked up in a residential truck or a commercial
- 8 truck because that's irrelevant and you don't want to
- 9 waste your time. You know?
- 10 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Can I get some clarification
- 11 on the chart?
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure.
- 13 MS. VAN KEKERIX: I think that Senator Roberti
- 14 had asked about getting information out to jurisdictions.
- 15 Is that correct? We're only going to be able to put on
- 16 the chart if you want to have up-to-date information
- 17 people that have done a new generation study. If we're
- 18 dealing with the bulk of the jurisdictions that have that
- 19 1990 base year, we could put a chart together but the
- 20 information, I believe, would be very out-of-date.
- 21 I think that a lot of communities have changed
- 22 over the last ten years. So if you'd like us to
- 23 distribute up-to-date information, we can go with the new
- 24 generation studies. We can put the other information
- 25 together and send it out, but it may be out-of-date if

- 1 we're going on the 1990 base years.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I would separate them. I
- 3 would like all the information but obviously new
- 4 generation studies are much more helpful, but -- so
- 5 separate those out and on one sheet and on another sheet,
- 6 you know, ask the questions. They may have good answers
- 7 on an out-of-date study, but I really think that to the
- 8 extent we get all of the information, this is just so
- 9 relevant when an extension is asked for because frankly,
- 10 it's the politics of the situation as much as anything,
- 11 and that is a lot of jurisdictions, I suspect, would
- 12 rather have us give them an extension than have to ask a
- 13 powerful group within their constituency to have to
- 14 participate in the programs, whereas other jurisdictions,
- 15 being much more environmentally oriented, are willing to
- 16 do it all. My suspicion.
- 17 I don't know if this is the case, but it
- 18 certainly helps all of us if we have the data. I
- 19 recognize, the Members sure recognize, that the new
- 20 generation studies are much more helpful, but --
- 21 MS. VAN KEKERIX: The old ones, many times they
- 22 missed whole sectors. There will be some problems with
- 23 those. We can put that together.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. And if one other thing
- 25 if you could do, was it the City of Sacramento or the

- 1 County of Sacramento that recently passed --
- 2 MS. MORGAN: City.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: They passed an ordinance or
- 4 resolution?
- 5 MS. MORGAN: I don't know for sure if it was
- 6 passed, but we have been working with them. We could
- 7 find out.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: The reason why, it might be
- 9 nice to have a sample for us to look at when we have this
- 10 discussion as to what other cities may have done. L.A.,
- 11 were you saying, was proposing or thinking about
- 12 proposing --
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: The mayor has been
- 14 talking about it, and I think because suddenly it's
- 15 hitting people that siting is directly related to the
- 16 demands that you place on various groups on diversion.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: So if any of those model
- 18 ordinances or ordinances that may have been passed
- 19 because I do believe as well that one of the legitimate
- 20 points that you will see is the lower income and people
- 21 of colored neighborhoods, minority neighborhoods, tend to
- 22 have less recycling or diversion. And perhaps if there's
- 23 an over-concentration of apartments, that helps solve
- 24 some of that problem as well. I don't know if that's a
- 25 linkage, but that's what we're trying to do is draw some

1 sort of link. Maybe the model ordinances would be

2 helpful. 3 Okay. Thank you very much. Any other 4 questions? Hearing none, that I believe is the last item for the April board meeting before we go to Visalia. So 6 without objection --7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Visalia is in May? 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: Visalia is in May, and that 9 will be two days because the second day will be devoted 10 to the extension principals, 1066, and we have a short 11 closed session. 12 So without objection, we'll adjourn the April 13 board meeting. I want to thank Selma and Jeannine for 14 filling in today on such short notice due to personal 15 emergencies of the two individuals who normally occupy 16 those chairs. Thank you, and thank you for not taking a 17 break today and going two hours. 18 And without objection, we'll stand adjourned until May. Thank you. 19 * * * 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	
3	
4	I, Terri L. Emery, CSR 11598, a Certified
5	Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California, do
6	hereby certify:
7	That the foregoing proceedings were taken
8	down by me in shorthand at the time and place named
9	therein and was thereafter transcribed under my
10	supervision; that this transcript contains a full, true
11	and correct record of the proceedings which took place at
12	the time and place set forth in the caption hereto.
13	
14	
15	I further certify that I have no interest
16	in the event of the action.
17	
18	
19	EXECUTED this 26th day of May, 2000.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Terri L. Emery
25	

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.	